Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/089,118	KITAGAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Blanche Wong	2616	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
All Participants:	Status of Applic	ation:	
(1) Blanche Wong.	(3)		
(2) James E. Ledbetter.	(4)		
Date of Interview: <u>17 May 2007</u>	Time:		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ N If Yes, provide a brief description:			
Part I.			٠
Rejection(s) discussed:			
Claims discussed: 25,30-32 Prior art documents discussed:			
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE See Continuation Sheet	GENERAL NATURE OF V	VHAT WAS DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a se directly resulted in the allowance of the applicat of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a se did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief second content in the content of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. 	ion. The examiner will prov parate record of the substa	ide a written summary of the s	substance
-			
•			
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (A	pplicant/Applicant's Repres	entative Signature – if appropr	iate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In claims 25,30 and 31, the phrase "said regenerator uses" should be "said regenerator uses a signal" that is being replaced. The limitation in claims 25, 30 and 31, should recite "said signal for suppressing peak power whose amplitude is quasizero". In claim 32, the phrase "said regeneration" should be "said regeneration uses a signal" that is being replaced. The limitation in claim 32 should recite "said signal for suppressing peak power whose amplitude is quasi-zero".